DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 041 EA 025 653

AUTHOR Schmitt, Donna M.
TITLE Integrating New Theory and Practice To Prepare Women for Roles in Educational Administration.
PUB DATE Feb 94
NOTE 28p.; Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Chicago, IL, February 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Education; *Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Training; Sex Fairness; *Women Administrators
IDENTIFIERS *Eastern Michigan University

ABSTRACT

There continues to be a great need for highly qualified and committed women to enter leadership positions in education. However, most research that is the basis for coursework in typical educational administration preparation programs has involved primarily male role incumbents in male-dominated organizations. Consequently, the characteristics equated with leadership in this research are masculine. In 1979, the Eastern Michigan University Educational Leadership program introduced a seminar entitled "Women in Leadership" (WIL) to examine how training programs for prospective educational leaders dealt with female leadership behavior. The course was extremely successful and appeared to address needs not previously met. A survey of graduates of WIL was done to determine which of the course objectives were most beneficial for women course participants. All students who took the seminar from fall 1979 through fall 1990, a total of 246 people, were surveyed. Demographic characteristics such as age and years of professional experience were determined. Students found the learning outcomes of the seminar to be positive and beneficial. Students also found the objectives dealing with leadership and personal development to be more beneficial than gender objectives. However, objectives dealing with gender issues were more beneficial than those dealing with network issues. A questionnaire is included. (Contains 27 references.) (JPT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 041

INTEGRATING NEW THEORY AND PRACTICE TO PREPARE WOMEN FOR ROLES IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION*

Donna M. Schmitt, Ed.D.
Associate Dean, College of Education
Professor, Educational Leadership
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

The need for highly qualified and committed women to move into leadership positions in the educational arena continues to be an issue of great concern in the field (Murphy, 1991; Hallinger and Murphy, 1991; Sergiovanni, 1991; Mertz and McNeely, 1990; Pavan, 1989; Shakeshaft, 1989; Bagenstos, 1987). The compositional elements of successful programs for preparing such individuals is a fertile and largely untilled field of investigation.

Almost all of the research that is the basis of coursework in typical educational administration preparation programs has involved primarily male role incumbents in male-dominated organizations. This research has, as its foundation and centerpiece, theory that was generally developed in corporate and industrial settings, beginning with the period of the Industrial Revolution and progressing into contemporary models. This theory defined effective organizations, and the roles for those who work in these organizations, as structured according to the propensities and beliefs of the people who have been their shapers, i.e., males. Thus, a review of theorists currently listed in educational administration texts is likely to indicate a group that is entirely, or almost entirely, male. Such theorists include: Herbert Simon (1957), Daniel Griffiths (1959), Douglas McGregor (1960), Rensis Likert (1961), Andrew Halpin (1966), Peter Drucker (1974), Ralph Stogdill (1974), James MacGregor Burns (1978), Bernard Bass (1981), Paul Hersey & Kenneth Blanchard (1988), among others.

Effective leadership, by definition of these theorists, is a set of behavioral indicators that is characteristically masculine. It was not by accident, then, that the first books written specifically for *women* who sought to enter leadership roles in organizations, while superficially addressing the fact that women had different propensities and beliefs, generally proposed

*Prepared for and delivered at the 1994 Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education; Chicago, Illinois; February 18, 1994.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Schmitt
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 025 653

that women shape their behaviors to fit the male models developed by the theorists, i.e., discard, to a great extent, that which was more characteristically "female," and become more masculine in their behaviors. Behaviors that were considered "good management" skills were typically those built on male socialization processes, including team-type activities of the sports' world model, and the utilitarian friendships found in the political realities purveyed via the coins of support and cooperation for the organization's sake (Hennig & Jardim, 1976). Examples of this "first generation" of women's books include *The Managerial Woman* (Hennig & Jardim, 1976) and *Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Gamesmanship for Women* (Harragan, 1977).

While this approach resulted in keeping organizations functioning "comfortably," it had negative repercussions for the women role incumbents in these organizations. The realization that something was not quite right with the situation began to be felt and heard in the mid-80's. Concerns were expressed in the literature, including texts such as *Feminine Leadership, or How to Succeed in Business Without Being One of the Boys* (Loden, 1985) and *The Female Advantage: Women's Ways of Leadership* (Helgesen, 1990), titles which prior to this time would have been considered oxymorons.

To address the need for examining the unique considerations of female leadership behavior in training programs for prospective educational leaders, a seminar entitled "Women in Leadership" (WIL) was introduced into the Educational Leadership program at Eastern Michigan University in 1979. In this course the history and current content of leadership theory was examined in light of the sociological and psychological assumptions, especially as related to gender-role differences. The course was extremely well-received by the students, with the demand for it such that it has been held at least once, and most often twice, a year since that time. Almost all the students who enrolled were women; and the overwhelming majority have noted (via course evaluations) what a major impact the course had on their thinking and development. It appeared that the course was addressing needs and leadership skill development for these students that were not being addressed in other, more traditional, Educational Leadership classes. However, further study was needed to determine exactly how and why the seminar was so successful.

Method

Subjects. In order to determine which of the WIL course objectives were the most beneficial for the women course participants, and how the benefits varied among the different students over a period of time subsequent to course enrollment, research was recently completed involving women who had been graduate students in the seminar. The initial sample included all the students who had completed the seminar in one of the 14 class sections held beginning with the Fall of 1979 through the Fall of 1990, for a total of 246 individuals. Since the research was limited to women students, and since the issues examined involved major considerations of societal and cultural factors as enacted in the United States, the eight men in the group and the four foreign women who had returned to their native countries at the time of the research were eliminated from the study. Also, it was found that one of the women in the sample had died. Thus, a total of 233 subjects were included in the final sample. Usable responses were received from 184 women (78.9%).

Procedures and Design. A questionnaire was developed and sent to the identified final sample. This instrument consisted of 17 questions grouped into four sections, and asked for:

- information on demographics concerning age and professional career activities;
- opinions about the felt benefits of the specific objectives of the WIL seminar, of the seminar overall, and of the career plan developed in the seminar;
- opinions about the possible benefits of specific objectives of a planned follow-up seminar, and suggestions for this seminar's content; and
- opinions about the felt importance of specific leadership skills' training for women. These skills were identified as ones not generally addressed in the male model of traditional educational administration programs (Schmitt, 1989), and were based on theory researching women's behaviors, beliefs, and value systems (Gilligan, 1982; Belenky *et al.*, 1986; Gilligan, 1990; Tannen, 1990; Brown & Gilligan, 1992). They included areas such as addressing multiple time and role demands, assertiveness, and self-assessment. (A copy of the entire questionnaire is appended to this report.)

There were five questions in the instrument that used a Likert-type scale for opinion identification; one question in the checklist format, allowing

multiple selections; and eleven open-ended questions. For purposes of this paper, responses to questions #1, 2, and 5 were analyzed to determine answers to the following questions:

- how did each respondent relatively value the several WIL objectives that were identified?
- how did the respondents as a group relatively value the several WIL objectives that were identified?
- how did the respondents vary in their responses when grouped by *age* at the time they participated in the WIL seminar, and by the *number of years in the profession* at the time they participated in the WIL seminar?

Univariate statistics, i.e. frequency, were used to obtain distributions involving the entire sample. For some questions, in order to compare the differences of the means between two groups, t-tests were the best choice. Factor analysis utilizing scale properties, based on conceptual groupings, was used to examine the correlation between the elements identified as the objectives for the WIL seminar. Relationships between these subscales and the demographic data of age of the students at the time of WIL enrollment, and number of years in the profession at the time of WIL enrollment, were calculated using Pearson product-moment correlations. Reliability estimates for the instrument used in this study were estimated using Cronbach's alpha coefficient of internal consistency.

Limitations. A potential limitation of this study was the nature of the sample, all of whom had self-selected to enroll in the WIL seminar. Since the course was elective, the sample might not be truly representative of the entire population of women who matriculate in graduate studies in educational administration. Also, because the department in which it was offered is Educational Leadership, there were non-school and post-K-12 leadership students, e.g., from the ranks of higher education administration, the health education profession and non-profit agencies, among the sample. These constituted approximately 10% of the group.

Results

Demographics. Of the 184 students who participated in the study, 29.2% of the participants enrolled in WIL at the age of between 21 to 30 years, 35.7% were between 31 and 40, 30.8% were between 41 and 50, and only 3.8% enrolled in WIL when they were over 50. The youngest age among

participants was 21 years old, while the oldest was 57. The distribution of the ages in WIL participants is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
THE DISTRIBUTION OF AGE LEVEL WHEN ENROLLED IN WIL

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MIN	MAX	PERCENT
21 to 30	54	26.78	2.37	.32	21	30	29.2
31 to 40	66	35.76	2.77	.34	31	40	35.7
41 to 50	57	45.49	2.71	.36	41	50	30.8
51 to 60	7	54.57	1.99	.75	52	57	3.8
TOTAL	184	36.85	8.51	.63	21	57	

Respondents were asked how many years they had been in their profession at the time they enrolled in WIL. Totals show that 35.7% of the participants had been in their profession from zero to five years, 26.5% for more than 15 years, 22.2% for six to ten years, and 14.1% for 11 to 15 years in their professions. There were some who had no years of professional experience, while the longest was 36 years in the profession. A summary of these data is shown in Table 2.

Table 2
THE DISTRIBUTION OF YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE WHEN ENROLLED IN WIL

GROUP	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	MIN	MAX	PERCENT
0 to 5	66	2.64	1.75	.21	0	5	35.7
6 to 10	41	8.10	1.66	.26	6	10	22.2
11 to 15	26	13.27	1.56	.31	11	15	14.1
More than 15	49	21.18	4.98	.71	16	36	26.5
TOTAL	182	10.38	8.03	.60	0	36	

About the WIL Seminar. Participants were asked to circle the number on a 5-point Likert scale that best reflected their rating of the learning outcomes (objectives) from WIL, according to how beneficial they feel each had been for them in their subsequent professional development (#5 on questionnaire). The responses indicated that the students had found the learning outcomes from WIL to be positive and beneficial. The summary of these results is shown in Table 3.

Table 3
THE DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS OF LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM WIL

VARIABLE	MDN.	MEAN	STD. DEV	MODE	MIN/MAX	VALID CASE	SCALE MEANING
SOCIALIZ	3	3.02	.86	3	0/4	181	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
PERCEPT	3	3.11	.79	3	0/4	182	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
JOBCAREE	3	3.11	.92	3	0/4	181	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
LDSFUNCT	3	3.19	.75	3	0/4	181	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
LDSDEMAN	3	3.24	.79	4	0/4	180	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
PERSTALE	3	3.17	.87	4	0/4	179	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
PERSDEVE	3	3.26	.82	4	0/4	180	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
INVCLASS	3	2.88	1.13	4	0/4	181	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
NETWORK	3	2.85	1.10	4	0/4	178	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
LDSROLE	3	3.04	.83	3	1/4	181	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
CAREERAD	3	3.08	.86	3	0/4	182	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
RESPONSE	4	3.45	.73	4	0/4	182	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY
SELFESTE	3	3.23	.82	4	0/4	182	NOT-MODERATELY-EXTREMELY

Scores on these 13 items in question #5 were analyzed using the iterated principal factor method. An orthogonal transformation of the factor loading was performed using the varimax procedure. Four major factors (eigenvalues greater than 1.0) were identified in Table 4, which subscales were earlier identified based on conceptual groupings.

Table 4
FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES FROM WIL

VARIABLE	FACTOR I	FACTOR II	FACTOR III	FACTOR IV
SOCIALIZ	.02	.15	.87	.18
PERCEPT	.09	.20	.86	.04
JOBCAREE	.45	.43	.38	.04
LDSFUNCT	.20	.88	.08	.10
LDSDEMAN	.20	.88	.12	.10
PERSTALE	.65	.38	.11	.12
PERSDEVE	.61	.07	.13	.45
INVCLASS	.10	.12	.07	.89
NETWORK	.27	.07	.13	.85
LDSROLE	.44	-.16	.56	.04
CAREERAD	.74	.06	.16	.19
RESPONSE	.77	.17	.04	.03
SELFESTE	.64	.33	.04	.25

Factor I was identified by several items that relate to personal development and was labeled ***personal***. Items with high loading on factor I were the following: PERSTALE (identification of personal leadership talents/potential), PERSDEVE (development of proactive strategies for personal growth and development), CAREERAD (identification of processes for use in career advancement), RESPONSE (acceptance of responsibility for

one's own self-development), and SELFESTE (development of positive self-esteem).

Factor II was identified by three items that relate to leadership issues and was labeled ***leader***. Items with high loading on factor II were the following: JOBCAREE (understanding of job vs. career), LDSFUNCT (identification of various leadership functions), and LDSDEMAN (identification of various leadership demands).

Factor III was identified by three items that relate to gender issues: SOCIALIZ (awareness of gender-related socialization process), PERCEPT (understanding of gender-related perceptual differences), and LDSROLE (awareness of past & current status of women in leadership roles). This factor was labeled ***gender***.

Factor IV was identified by two items that relate to network issues: INVCLASS (involvement with a group of like-minded women) and NETWORK (opportunity for networking). This factor was labeled ***classnet***.

Using these four factors as the basis of analysis, paired t-tests were completed to determine which of these factors (learning outcomes/objectives) were more beneficial for the overall group. The results showed that there were significant differences between ***gender*** and ***leader*** ($t=-2.23$, $p<.05$), ***gender*** and ***classnet*** ($t=2.72$, $p<.01$), and ***gender*** and ***personal*** ($t=-3.47$, $p<.001$). For these women students, the objectives dealing with leadership issues were more beneficial than those dealing with gender issues; the objectives dealing with personal development were more beneficial than those dealing with gender issues; but the objectives dealing with gender issues were more beneficial than those dealing with network issues. In addition, there were significant differences between ***leader*** and ***classnet*** ($t=4.22$, $p<.0001$), and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** ($t=-5.86$, $p<.0001$). According to students' responses, both the ***leader*** factor and the ***personal*** factor were more beneficial than the ***classnet*** factor. There was no significant difference between the benefits of the ***leader*** factor and the ***personal*** factor. These results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5
THE COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES FOR ALL STUDENTS

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	183	3.06	.67	.05	-2.23	.027*
LEADER		3.18	.68	.05		
GENDER	182	3.07	.66	.05	2.72	.007**
CLASSNET		2.86	1.03	.08		
GENDER	183	3.06	.67	.05	-3.47	.001***
PERSONAL		3.24	.64	.05		
LEADER	182	3.19	.68	.05	4.22	.000****
CLASSNET		2.86	1.03	.08		
LEADER	183	3.18	.68	.05	-1.25	.211
PERSONAL		3.24	.64	.05		
CLASSNET	182	2.86	1.03	.08	-5.86	.000****
PERSONAL		3.24	.64	.05		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Analysis by Age Group. A comparison of the benefits of learning outcomes for the students when grouped by age at the time of their enrollment in the seminar shows that, for students of 21 to 30 years of age, there were significant differences between ***gender*** and ***classnet*** (t=2.04, p<.05), ***leader*** and ***classnet*** (t=2.58, p<.05), and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** (t=-3.62, p<.001). This age group considered the learning outcomes related to gender issues, leadership issues, and personal development issues to be more beneficial than network issues.

For students who enrolled in WIL at the age of 31 to 40, there were significant differences between ***gender*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.31, p<.05), ***leader*** and ***classnet*** (t=3.21, p<.01), and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** (t=-3.41, p<.001). Students of this age group thought the learning outcomes related to personal development issues were more beneficial than those relating to gender issues;

and both leadership objectives and personal development issues' objectives were more beneficial than those dealing with networks.

There were significant differences for students in the age group of 41 to 50, between ***gender*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.43, p<.05), ***leader*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.72,p<.01), and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.85, p<.01). Students in this group indicated that the learning outcomes dealing with personal development issues were more beneficial than those related to gender issues, leadership issues, and network issues.

For students who enrolled in WIL at the age of over 50, there were not any significant differences among the various factors of learning outcomes. All learning outcomes were equally beneficial for them.

The results of these comparisons by different age groups are shown in the Tables 6, 7, 8, and 9.

Table 6
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR AGES 21 TO 30

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	53	3.06	.75	.10	-1.43	.12
LEADER		3.21	.72	.10		
GENDER	53	3.07	.75	.10	2.04	.047*
CLASSNET		2.80	1.00	.14		
GENDER	53	3.06	.75	.10	-1.34	.187
PERSONAL		3.19	.70	.10		
LEADER	53	3.21	.72	.10	2.58	.013*
CLASSNET		2.80	1.00	.14		
LEADER	53	3.21	.72	.10	.22	.829
PERSONAL		3.19	.70	.10		
CLASSNET	53	2.80	1.00	.14	-3.62	.001***
PERSONAL		3.19	.70	.10		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Table 7
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR AGES 31 TO 40

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	66	3.06	.66	.08	-1.61	.112
LEADER		3.23	.70	.09		
GENDER	66	3.06	.66	.08	1.71	.091
CLASSNET		2.85	1.09	.13		
GENDER	66	3.06	.66	.08	-2.31	.037*
PERSONAL		3.26	.66	.08		
LEADER	66	3.23	.70	.09	3.21	.002**
CLASSNET		2.85	1.09	.13		
LEADER	66	3.23	.70	.10	-.44	.665
PERSONAL		3.26	.66	.10		
CLASSNET	66	2.85	1.09	.13	-3.40	.001***
PERSONAL		3.26	.66	.08		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Table 8
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR AGES 41 TO 50

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	56	3.04	.63	.09	.29	.771
LEADER		3.07	.64	.09		
GENDER	55	3.06	.62	.08	.74	.464
CLASSNET		2.95	.93	.13		
GENDER	56	3.04	.63	.09	-2.43	.018*
PERSONAL		3.25	.59	.08		
LEADER	55	3.09	.63	.09	1.02	.315
CLASSNET		2.95	.93	.13		
LEADER	56	3.07	.64	.09	-2.72	.009**
PERSONAL		3.25	.59	.08		
CLASSNET	55	2.95	.93	.13	-2.85	.006**
PERSONAL		3.28	.57	.08		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Table 9
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR AGES 51 TO 60

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	7	3.14	.38	.14	-1.08	.321
LEADER		3.33	.47	.18		
GENDER	7	3.14	.38	.14	1.33	.232
CLASSNET		2.43	1.40	.53		
GENDER	7	3.14	.38	.14	-.56	.596
PERSONAL		3.27	.45	.17		
LEADER	7	3.33	.47	.19	1.48	.190
CLASSNET		2.43	1.40	.53		
LEADER	7	3.33	.47	.19	.28	.790
PERSONAL		3.27	.45	.17		
CLASSNET	7	2.43	1.40	.53	-2.04	.087
PERSONAL		3.27	.45	.57		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Analysis by Length of Professional Experience. A comparison of the benefits of learning outcomes for the students when grouped by the number of years of professional experience at the time of their enrollment in the seminar shows that, for students who had been in their professions from zero to five years, there were significant differences between ***gender*** and ***classnet*** (t=2.67, p≤.05), ***leader*** and ***classnet*** (t=3.03, p<.01), and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** (t=-3.99, p<.0001). Students in this group considered that the learning outcomes related to gender issues, leadership issues, and personal development issues were more beneficial than networking issues.

For students who had been in their profession from six to ten years, there were significant differences between ***gender*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.58, p<.05) and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.56, p<.05). This group of students thought that the learning outcomes related to personal development issues were more

beneficial than those outcomes related to gender issues and networking issues.

For students who had been in their professions from 11 to 15 years, there was not any significant differences among the various factors of learning outcomes. All learning outcomes were equally beneficial for this group.

There were significant differences for students in their professions over 16 years between ***gender*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.77, p<.01) and ***classnet*** and ***personal*** (t=-2.68, p<.01). Students in this group indicated that the learning outcomes related to personal development were more beneficial than those of gender issues and networking issues. The results of these comparison of different age groups are shown in Tables 10, 11, 12, and 13.

Table 10
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR THOSE WITH 0 TO 5 YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	65	3.06	.71	.09	-1.11	.272
LEADER		3.15	.65	.08		
GENDER	64	3.08	.70	.09	2.67	.010**
CLASSNET		2.73	1.04	.13		
GENDER	65	3.06	.71	.09	-1.68	.098
PERSONAL		3.20	.59	.07		
LEADER	64	3.17	.64	.08	3.03	.004**
CLASSNET		2.73	1.04	.13		
LEADER	65	3.15	.65	.08	-0.61	.542
PERSONAL		3.20	.59	.07		
CLASSNET	64	2.73	1.04	.13	-3.99	.000****
PERSONAL		3.22	.57	.07		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Table 11
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR THOSE WITH 6 TO 10 YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	41	2.94	.65	.10	-1.35	.185
LEADER		3.09	.72	.11		
GENDER	41	2.94	.65	.10	.79	.432
CLASSNET		2.82	1.08	.17		
GENDER	41	2.94	.65	.10	-2.58	.014*
PERSONAL		3.16	.71	.11		
LEADER	41	3.09	.72	.11	1.81	.077
CLASSNET		2.82	1.08	.17		
LEADER	41	3.09	.72	.11	-0.70	.490
PERSONAL		3.16	.71	.11		
CLASSNET	41	2.82	1.08	.17	-2.56	.014*
PERSONAL		3.16	.71	.11		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Table 12
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR THOSE WITH 11 TO 15 YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	26	3.06	.77	.15	-0.64	.529
LEADER		3.20	.87	.17		
GENDER	26	3.06	.77	.15	1.03	.312
CLASSNET		2.83	1.06	.21		
GENDER	26	3.06	.77	.15	-0.48	.632
PERSONAL		3.16	.86	.17		
LEADER	26	3.20	.87	.17	1.83	.080
CLASSNET		2.83	1.06	.21		
LEADER	26	3.20	.87	.17	0.32	.755
PERSONAL		3.16	.86	.17		
CLASSNET	26	2.83	1.06	.21	-2.00	.057
PERSONAL		3.16	.86	.17		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

Table 13
COMPARISON OF BENEFITS OF WIL LEARNING OUTCOMES
FOR THOSE WITH OVER 16 YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	STANDARD ERROR	t-VALUE	P
GENDER	48	3.12	.55	.08	-1.65	.106
LEADER		3.26	.60	.09		
GENDER	48	3.12	.55	.08	0.63	.596
CLASSNET		3.04	.96	.14		
GENDER	48	3.12	.55	.08	-2.77	.008**
PERSONAL		3.37	.52	.08		
LEADER	48	3.26	.60	.09	1.50	.141
CLASSNET		3.04	.96	.14		
LEADER	48	3.26	.60	.09	-1.34	.186
PERSONAL		3.37	.52	.08		
CLASSNET	48	3.04	.96	.14	-2.68	.010**
PERSONAL		3.37	.52	.08		

*p≤.05
**p≤.01
***p≤.001
****p≤.0001

In order to know whether there were any relationships between the age of the students when enrolled in the seminar and the benefit of the various learning outcomes; and the number of years of professional experience and the benefit of the various learning outcomes, the data were examined using correlation coefficients. The results showed that there was not a significant relationship between age for students enrolling in WIL and the perceived benefit of the learning outcomes. Neither was there a significant relationship between years of professional experience and benefits from the learning outcomes. No matter what age at the time of enrollment, nor how much professional experience they had, these women students benefited similarly from the learning outcomes of the class. These results are shown in Tables 14 and 15.

Table 14
THE CORRELATION BETWEEN AGE OF STUDENTS
WHEN ENROLLED IN WIL AND BENEFIT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES

FACTOR	VARIABLE	RHO
GENDER		.0082
	SOCIALIZ	.0025
	PERCEPT	.0143
	LDSROLE	.0186
LEADER		-.0453
	JOBCAREE	-.0204
	LDSFUNCT	-.0326
	LDSDEMAN	-.0471
PERSONAL		.0585
	PERSTALE	.0757
	PERSDEVE	.0989
	CAREERAD	.0783
	RESPONSE	.0634
	SELFESTE	-.1081
CLASSNET		.0081
	INVCLASS	-.0022
	NETWORK	.0178

*p≤.05

Table 15
THE CORRELATION BETWEEN YEARS OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE
WHEN ENROLLED IN WIL AND BENEFIT OF LEARNING OUTCOMES

FACTOR	VARIABLE	RHO
GENDER		.0129
	SOCIALIZ	.0481
	PERCEPT	.0433
	LDSROLE	-.0463
LEADER		.0477
	JOBCAREE	-.0100
	LDSFUNCT	.0962
	LDSDEMAN	.0555
PERSONAL		.0428
	PERSTALE	.0600
	PERSDEVE	.0852
	CAREERAD	.0261
	RESPONSE	.1021
	SELFESTE	-.0399
CLASSNET		.0881
	INVCLASS	.0785
	NETWORK	.0689

*p≤.05

The reliability of the various sub items in question #5 were analyzed. and showed alpha coefficients for these factors that ranged from .73 to .82. The results of these reliability tests are shown in Table 16.

Table 16
MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATIONS, AND RELIABILITY ESTIMATES
FOR SUB ITEMS OF LEARNING OUTCOMES' FACTORS

VARIABLE	N	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	RELIABILITY(α)
GENDER				.73
SOCIALIZ	162	3.01	.86	
PERCEPT	162	3.12	.80	
LDSROLE	162	3.07	.81	
LEADER				.77
JOBCAREE	162	3.14	.96	
LDSFUNCT	162	3.20	.75	
LDSDEMAN	162	3.22	.80	
CLASSNET				.80
INVCLASS	162	2.88	1.10	
NETWORK	162	2.83	1.09	
PERSONAL				.82
PERSTALE	162	3.19	.86	
PERSDEVE	162	3.29	.77	
CAREERAD	162	3.09	.84	
RESPONSE	162	3.48	.72	
SELFESTE	162	3.20	.82	

Discussion

The findings of this research suggest several areas of focus for those who are providing pre-service and in-service training for professional educational leaders. First, as a group, there are similar, positive responses regarding the benefits of the objectives/learning outcomes of the WIL seminar across the entire spectrum of women students, no matter what their chronological age or level of professional experience. Among the four factors that were identified for these objectives, the factors dealing with leadership issues and with personal development issues were the most beneficial for the entire group, followed by the factor dealing with gender issues. Those objectives addressing networking issues were found to be the least beneficial, when compared to the other three factors. This comparison would lead one to conclude that the intrinsic content of course objectives (leadership, personal development and gender issues), rather than the setting in which it occurs (opportunity for networking among the class members), are the most important factors in the success of the seminar. It also appears that those issues which relate directly and personally to the students in their perceived and/or anticipated roles as educational leaders (***leader*** and ***personal*** factors)

are the ones with which women students most closely identify as beneficial. Those objectives which are less individual and directly involving of the student herself were rated lower. Perhaps, as Gilligan (1990) and others have indicated in their research, this personal connection to the course content is more highly valued by women than those learning outcomes which take the objective, abstract approach to course delivery. Thus, it would behoove us, as those who deliver training for women in educational administration, to examine whether the content of our courses addresses these intrinsically meaningful objectives, or whether we deliver more or less sterile theories and concepts, more or less connected to those issues that have personal identification for the women in our classes.

The analysis of the perceived benefits of these WIL course objectives by age groupings shows that the younger students find the leadership issues and gender issues to be most beneficial, perhaps because this course might be their first real exposure to these learning objectives. Among the more mature students (31+), personal development issues head the list of benefits. However, for those students 51+, all areas were perceived equally beneficial. This leads to the conclusion that it might be advantageous to shape the contextual emphasis of educational administration courses according to age range of the class members. Perhaps course assignments might even be adjusted to address these individual differences.

When looking at the analysis of the data as grouped by years of professional experience, the personal development and leadership issues are the two most beneficial for all groups, with gender issues rated as also very beneficial. In all groups, networking opportunities again garners the lowest ratings. Interestingly, however, the four factors are valued equally for those with 11 to 15 years of experience. This group would most likely be working in their first administrative position, and thus, might see all the objectives as more directly related to them. The highest actual rating for the networking factor is found among those with the most experience. Again, these data may very well indicate that there would be benefits for women students if course content, structure and assignments addressed personally meaningful objectives that "spoke to" and allowed them to build on their professional experiences.

In summary it seems that the objectives of the WIL seminar are very beneficial to these women students, perhaps because the course content is

intrinsically meaningful and delivered in a format that recognizes "real," personal dimensions of "being a women" and "in a leadership role." This research strongly suggests that both of these factors need to be addressed in the training that is provided for women students in educational administration programs.

References

Bagenstos, N. (1987). Minorities and women in educational administration. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southeastern Educational Improvement Laboratory.

Bass, B. (1981). Handbook of leadership: A survey of theory and research. NY: Free Press.

Belenky, M., *et al.* (1986). Women's ways of knowing. NY: Harper & Row.

Brown, L, and Gilligan, C. (1992). Meeting at the crossroads. NY: Ballantine Books.

Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. NY: Harper & Row.

Drucker, P. (1974). Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices. NY: Harper & Row.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

_____. (1990) Making connections. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Griffiths, D. (1959). Administrative theory. NY: Appleton-Century-Croft.

Hallinger, P., and Murphy, J. (1991). Developing leaders for tomorrow's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 514-20.

Halpin, A. (1966). Theory and research in administration. NY: Macmillan.

Harragan, B. (1977). Games mother never taught you. NY: Warner Books.

Helgesen, S. (1990). Female advantage. NY: Bantam Doubleday.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1976). The managerial woman. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1988). Management of organizational behavior (4th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Loden, M. (1985). Feminine leadership. NY: Times Books.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Mertz, N., and McNeely, S. (1990, April). Groundbreakers: Females who "succeed" in male-dominated line administrative positions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Murphy, J. (1991). Superintendents as saviors: From the terminator to Pogo. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 507-13.

Pavan, B. (1989, October). Searching for female leaders for America's schools: Are the women to blame? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Scottsdale, AZ.

Schmitt, D. (1989). Analysis of skill development in Eastern Michigan University's Educational Leadership program. Unpublished manuscript, Eastern Michigan University, College of Education, Ypsilanti, Michigan.

Sergiovanni, T. (1991). The dark side of professionalism in educational administration. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 521-6.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration (Updated ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Simon, H. (1957). Administrative behavior (2nd ed.).. NY: Macmillan.

Stogdill, R. (1974). Handbook of leadership. NY: Free Press.

Tannen, D. (1990). You just don't understand. NY: Wm. Morrow.

APPENDIX
QUESTIONNAIRE/WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP SEMINAR

Donna M. Schmitt, Ed.D.
Eastern Michigan University

≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈≈

WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP SURVEY

Thank you for taking time from your busy schedule to assist me by completing the following questionnaire. Your responses to the these questions will be used by the Educational Leadership program to improve its current course offerings, and to assist in the preparation of new course offerings, with the aim to better serve women seeking to become leaders in education. All responses will be absolutely confidential. Data will be aggregated and reported in group form only, with no identification of specific responses.

Demographics

The following questions will help to determine if training needs are different for women at different times in their lives and/or in their careers.

1. What was your age at the time you enrolled in Women in Leadership Seminar (WIL)?_____

2. How many years had you been in your profession at the time you enrolled in WIL?_____

3. List chronologically your professional positions since completing WIL (EX: Elementary teacher, 1985-87; Reading consultant, 1987-present):

_____

_____

_____

4. **Check as many** of the following statements as are true of you since WIL:

_____I am not currently in a leadership position, but I am actively pursuing one.
_____I am not currently in a leadership position, and have not actively pursued one.
_____I am not currently in a leadership position, but I plan to actively pursue one in the next several years.
_____I am currently in a leadership position, the same one I had prior to WIL, and am actively pursuing another one.
_____I am currently in a leadership position, the same one I had prior to WIL, and am not actively pursuing another one.
_____I have achieved a new leadership position, and am actively pursuing another one.
_____I have achieved a new leadership position, and am not actively pursuing another one.
_____I have decided to stop pursuing a desired leadership position because of personal reasons, such as change in family status, personal time demands, etc.
_____I have been kept from achieving a desired leadership position by external factors beyond my control, such as bias or politics on the part of the hiring agency, lack of opportunity, etc.
Please state reason:_____

If you have not checked any of the above statements, describe your current situation regarding the seeking of leadership positions:

_____

About the WIL Class..

The following questions are about the Women in Leadership Seminar which you completed in the Educational Leadership program. Responses to these questions will help determine the effectiveness of the content of this course.

5. Please **circle** the number that best reflects your ratings of **each** of the following "learning outcomes" from WIL, according to how **beneficial** you feel it has been for you in your subsequent professional development.

	Not 0	Slightly 1	Moderately 2	Quite 3	Extremely 4
Awareness of gender-related socialization processes	0	1	2	3	4
Understanding of gender-related perceptual differences	0	1	2	3	4
Understanding of job vs. career	0	1	2	3	4
Identification of various leadership functions	0	1	2	3	4
Identification of various leadership demands	0	1	2	3	4
Identification of personal leadership talents/potential	0	1	2	3	4
Development of proactive strategies for personal growth and development	0	1	2	3	4
Involvement with a group of like-minded women (class members)	0	1	2	3	4
Opportunity for networking	0	1	2	3	4
Awareness of past & current status of women in leadership roles	0	1	2	3	4
Identification of processes for use in career advancement	0	1	2	3	4
Acceptance of responsibility for one's own self-development	0	1	2	3	4
Development of positive self-esteem	0	1	2	3	4

6. In addition to those listed above, what **other** "learning outcome(s)" did you achieve as a result of WIL?

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. What **one** "learning outcome" from WIL was the most beneficial? **Why** was it so beneficial?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. **Overall**, how beneficial were the "learning outcomes" you gained from WIL? (Circle one number.)

Not 0	Slightly 1	Moderately 2	Quite 3	Extremely 4

9. **Mark** the column that best reflects your agreement with **each** of these statements about the Five-Year Plan developed in WIL.

	Strongly Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I have found it to be very beneficial in giving direction to my professional (work-related) development.				
I have found it to be very beneficial in giving direction to my personal (non work-related) decisions.				
I have not used it at all since I wrote it.				
I have reviewed it at least once a year.				
I have been working at it and have made progress on achieving the goals within the broad time frames I planned.				
I have adjusted it, but it is still essentially the same.				
I have found that I have had to substantially modify it because it was not workable.				
I have achieved the plan, and have written a new one.				
I have achieved the plan, but I have never written a new one.				

About the Next Class...

The following questions are about the proposed advanced seminar entitled Next Steps for Women in Leadership (WIL II), which is planned to be offered in the Educational Leadership program. Responses to these questions will help determine the content of this course.

10. Please **circle** the number that best reflects your ratings of **each** of the following "expected learning outcomes" of the Next Steps Seminar, according to how **beneficial** you feel it could be for you in your anticipated professional development.

	Not 0	Slightly 1	Moderately 2	Quite 3	Extremely 4
Review (overview) of major concepts from WIL	0	1	2	3	4
Update information on current literature in field of women in leadership	0	1	2	3	4
Understanding of leadership concepts and development of strategies for:					
a. Shared personal vision	0	1	2	3	4
b. Information management	0	1	2	3	4
c. Dealing with strengths/weaknesses	0	1	2	3	4
d. Communication	0	1	2	3	4
e. Empowerment	0	1	2	3	4
f. Problem/conflict mgmt./resolution	0	1	2	3	4
Guided practice in leadership strategies for:					
a. Shared personal vision	0	1	2	3	4
b. Information management	0	1	2	3	4
c. Dealing with strengths/weaknesses	0	1	2	3	4
d. Communication	0	1	2	3	4
e. Empowerment	0	1	2	3	4
f. Problem/conflict mgmt./resolution	0	1	2	3	4
Understanding of life stages/life transitions, & their relationship to prof. development	0	1	2	3	4
Enhancement of networking skills/strategies	0	1	2	3	4
Development of a "Next Steps" Professional Development Plan	0	1	2	3	4

11. In addition to those described above, what **other** learning outcomes would be beneficial for you in the "Next Steps" class?

_____

_____

_____

12. Do you have any **suggestions for books** or other materials (print or A-V) that would be beneficial in the "Next Steps" class?

_____

_____

_____

13. Any **other suggestions** for "Next Steps"?

_____

_____

_____

Skill Identification

The following questions will help to identify specific leadership skills' training that is important for women.

14. Please **circle** the number that best reflects your ratings of **each** of the following leadership skills according to how **important** you feel it is for women to receive training in them.

	Not 0	Slightly 1	Moderately 2	Quite 3	Extremely 4
Coping					
a. Ability to manage conflict through collaboration and shared goal-setting in the area of time demands.	0	1	2	3	4
b. Ability to manage conflict through collaboration and shared goal-setting in the area of role demands.	0	1	2	3	4
c. Ability to manage conflict through collaboration and shared goal-setting in the area of perceptual demands of differing constituencies.	0	1	2	3	4
Internal Presentation					
a. Ability to recognize innate personal skills as base for healthy self-confidence.	0	1	2	3	4
b. Ability to maintain a self-concept that is motivated by response to the needs of the group, but balanced by attention to personal needs.	0	1	2	3	4

	Not 0	Slightly 1	Moderately 2	Quite 3	Extremely 4
External Presentation					
a. Ability to develop and use contacts within the profession to build an information system.	0	1	2	3	4
b. Ability to develop and use contacts within the profession to build an advice system.	0	1	2	3	4
c. Ability to develop and use contacts within the profession to build a support system.	0	1	2	3	4
Assertiveness					
a. Ability to communicate honestly and directly.	0	1	2	3	4
b. Ability to recognize the rights of of others while maintaining one's own rights.	0	1	2	3	4

15. Any **suggestions for other experiences** that ought to be part of a leadership training program for women?

_____

_____

_____

16. Any other comments?

_____

_____

_____

17. Would you be willing to be interviewed as part of a follow-up to this survey? YES NO

- - - -